HUMAN EVENTS

FRANK C. HANIGHEN, *Editor* *Contributing Editors:* FRANK CHODOROV, WILLIS J. BALLINGER

Volume XII, No. 19 Saturday, May 7, 1955 Washington, D. C.

News Section Printed in Three Sections

When Governors Gather: Two potential leaders of American conservatism literally faded out in the "show window" where are periodically exhibited the "coming men" among American state governors. At the meeting of governors in Washington this week, Kohler of Wisconsin and Craig of Indiana were chided by colleagues for their change in stand on the issue of Federal aid to the states.

In 1952 — Kohler was cruelly reminded — he led the Houston Governors meeting in rejecting the Truman drive for Federal aid to states and rallied a large part of the governors with him. Craig of Indiana a year ago also took much the same position. Now both back the President's Federal Highway aid. Elsewhere in the Capital at the same time, Senator Byrd, Democrat, with former President Hoover's blessing, assailed the Republican Administration's policy which he characterized as the "Pandora's box of Federal handouts."

Why the change of these two former stalwarts of Republicanism? According to one story in State Department circles, Mrs. Kohler, who has never reportedly been content with the provincial Wisconsin scene, wants a diplomatic post abroad for her husband. The name of Craig has often been linked with reports of Administration appointments to big posts in Washington.

● Governor J. Bracken Lee twice this week challenged the "liberal" Kohler: (1) to tell why he thinks the Eisenhower regime is in any way different from the Democratic New Deal administrations. (Lee makes no bones that he himself sees no difference.) (2) To tell why he, the Wisconsin governor, has changed his former opposition to Federal handouts to states. Both times, observers could make little sense of Kohler's attempts to reply.

● Lee also prodded Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey when the latter sought to express approval of the Eisenhower highway plan. Humphrey had a difficult time apologizing for the Alice-in-Wonderland financing of the scheme, a Government guarantee of a debt not recognized as a Federal debt. Byrd scornfully calls this "financial legerdemain." "Mr. Secretary," asked the pertinacious Governor Lee of Utah, "how do you think you can ignore the experience of 1,000 years of economics and get away with it?" The Secretary could not muster a rejoinder.

● One Republican Governor at a dinner party taunted Senator Lehman: "How are you Democrats hoping to win in 1956, when Ike has stolen your 'liberal' program?" Lehman replied: "I would say the Democrats probably would lose, but for the fact that Republicans are split. It's true, you'll have the Democrats' program; but you won't, for that reason, get enough Republicans to go to the polls."

● The Democrats cough hastily when prodded about their own party split. Conservative Democratic Governor Lausche was virtually a pariah among the rest of his Democratic colleagues. Most of the Northern Democrats are New Dealers and the one other Northern conservative governor, Ed Johnson of Colorado, did not even come to the meeting. Lausche is hailed as the only big Democratic figure who isn't — as the saying goes — "bought and paid for by the labor bosses." Some conservative Republican governors said privately that they would support Lausche for President in 1956, in the unlikely event that the Democratic convention would nominate him.

Wisconsin Story: The national governors conference in Washington, concluded during the past 48 hours, was marked by a lot of private discussion of the split in the GOP. One item of evidence, closely

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

examined by GOP governors, came from Wisconsin where last week the Young Republicans of that state held a convention characterized by virtual defiance of the White House.

Wisconsin commands importance in any estimate of the situation, for any politico recalls how for half a century that state has proved an index of what the rest of the Middle West is thinking. In the early years of the century, Robert M. La Follette of Wisconsin rallied the "progressive movement" within the GOP which had serious repercussions on the fate of the party. In those days, La Follette led the Midwest against the trusts and Wall Street. In the past decade, Wisconsin has been in the forefront of the movement against New Dealism, internationalism and Communism. It is no accident that McCarthy comes from Wisconsin.

Hence, rebel yells of young Republicans in La Crosse last week riveted attention of governors who look over the landscape for clues as to what might happen in 1956. As reported to this column, delegates booed a resolution (quickly dropped) to endorse Wisconsin congressmen for their support of Eisenhower; also the Young Republicans wildly cheered the name of McCarthy. A resolution was passed which declared that McCarthy "was the first to awaken America to the threat of Communism," and mentioned that the government had given him a refund on federal tax payments.

What startled Washingtonians — constantly informed by the Eastern press that the country opposes defense of Quemoy and Matsu — was the news that the Young Republicans of that so-called "isolationist" state passed a resolution demanding that the President "hold firm" to the position that the two islands will be defended against the Chinese Reds. "England would like to let Quemoy and Matsu go. Therefore, I would say, 'keep them'," said John Studinger of Appleton. The resolution passed 50 to 38.

The Milwaukee "liberal" *Journal* was constrained to report, "McCarthy's name got most applause; Ike's, not so much." That paper also had to report that Governor Kohler, often called a "coat-tail rider," got only tepid support. Finally, Senator Alexander Wiley, another Administration "rider" and a candidate for re-election next year was entirely ignored.

Wisconsinites say that Wiley is doomed by the Party. Some other Republican, it is affirmed, will replace him as candidate next year. Representative Lawrence Smith, independent Republican of Racine, is prominently mentioned.

Billions, Baloney and Formosa: The calm that has stilled the Far Eastern waters has been broken only by some interesting propaganda, which suggests how and why the present calm was concocted and what it may lead to.

Although the official version of the "easing of the tension" is that the Chinese Reds have agreed to discuss at a meeting (from which Free China is excluded) a "cease-fire" in the Formosa area — diplomats here point out that Chinese Red leader Chou En-lai has never asked for nor showed any interest in a "cease-fire" arrangement.

During the past few days, emerging bits of what seem like propaganda feed-outs suggest just what Chou wants and what the Administration seeks to give him "to be a good boy." Reston of the *New York Times* on May 4 reported that Administration officials are talking "much more openly" of "relaxing the trade embargo" against Red China. At the same time, Reston said that Harold Stassen in his new cabinet post is "taken seriously in the White House." These two items add up. Stassen (now Secretary of Peace and Disarmament) is the great exponent of trade with the Reds, both in China and Russia.

Various other press stories which look like planned and synchronized leaks from the Executive branch support the conclusion that "what's behind it all" is a developing Administration plan to buy off Soviet Russia and Red China and make them "peace-loving" nations.

Standby Controls: Although little is said publicly about standby controls, requested by the President in January, a lot of private talk goes on. Economists fear that the mere existence of such controls over prices and wages will spark a tendency on the part of the seller to keep his quoted prices high. For thus — the seller would calculate — he would not be caught in a disadvantageous position if prices were suddenly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

frozen, should an emergency break. From this point of view, standby controls over wages and prices would have an inflationary effect and would have some rather unsettling results on business conditions, in short inflationary consequences.

Standby legislation would also, it is felt, create a tendency among the labor bosses to press for the highest possible wages, for they would not want to be caught by a wage freeze. In view of these considerations, trade associations are opposing reinstitution of such controls, even on a standby basis.

Labor Front: Two 7-week old Southern strikes have received little attention in the news pages and almost none on the editorial pages of the daily press. You'd never know of the growing violence and destruction from a reading of the national affairs columns of Stokes, Childs, Fleeson, Mrs. Roosevelt, Lippmann, the Alsops, Drew Pearson or Robert S. Allen. Perhaps — say some observers here — we have reached the point that what happens to employer-owned property or to non-strikers isn't news any more.

One of the strikes is against the Southern Bell Telephone Company. Whenever sabotage slows down, Joseph A. Beirne, CIO Communications Union President, urges the telephone strikers to "get madder" and warns that "scabs and others who have taken temporary jobs will be dealt with — with justice — I hope."

An incendiary fire destroyed the $250,000 telephone exchange at Belle Glade, Florida. A telephone building in Jackson, Mississippi, was blown to bits. A home-made bomb blasted the concrete roof of a telephone exchange in a suburb of New Orleans. The cutting of telephone cables has become a daily occurrence.

The fact that one-third of the telephone workers stayed on the job — risking injury to themselves and their homes — suggests the strong worker-opposition to the strike. The lone issue outstanding is a "no-strike clause" demanded by Southern Bell which was subjected to 105 wildcat strikes during the last four years.

The telephone union, which lost its last strike against Southern Bell in 1947, appealed for help to pro-union Governor Folsom of Alabama. "Kissin' Jim" responded by asking the legislature for the right to seize the properties of struck public utilities.

Such a law would also affect the Alabama portion of the second big Southern labor dispute. This strike — against the Louisville & Nashville Railroad — has halted all passenger service and cut freight service to 25 percent of normal.

Competitive railroads, bus lines and truck lines have taken up much of the slack, but a number of mines and factories have been forced to close.

Fire, bullets and dynamitings have also characterized this strike. Three railroad bridges have been destroyed and a fourth — near Pineville, Kentucky — was saved only by the discovery by a state trooper of 25 sticks of electrically-connected dynamite attached to the bridge.

Waste In Lending: Under the New Deal, radical bureaucrats set up a catch-all system of credit for the farmer that virtually ensured that no farmer seeking a loan would be turned down. If a farmer had a sound business proposition, he could go to a Federal Land Bank. The Federal Land Banks today have paid back all the capital originally borrowed from the government, are privately-owned and operated and have a splendid loan record.

But if a farmer had a somewhat risky proposition, he could borrow from the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation. If he was a *complete* risk, he could knock on the door of the Farmers Home Administration. And if he was wiped out by some disaster, which included any collapse in prices, salvation was provided by the Regional Agricultural Credit Corporation, later taken over by the Farmers Home Administration.

The Hoover Commission has just looked into the Farmers Home Administration which is still with us, although originally launched as an emergency organization. The story is a sad one. Hundreds of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

thousands of loans have been written off involving losses of around $161,000,000. At present $115,000,000 in loans are in default. Most of these losses occurred in a period when agricultural income was at a high level. In 1953 the agency had a payroll of six thousand and a total administrative overhead of $29,000,000 — a sum that came out of the pockets of taxpayers through Congressional appropriation because Congress has never even attempted to make the agency pay administrative expenses out of its business income. Over the past 20 years, its administrative costs have run into the tens of millions. At the beginning of 1954, a reorganization was proclaimed with a view to cutting administrative costs. But, in the past fiscal year, the agency still nicked the Treasury for $25,934,000.

In 1949, the Farmers Home Administration absorbed the dissolved Regional Credit Corporation, including its work of paying for disasters. The story here is that, although Congress has given $205,857,000 for a disaster loan policy, this account is now *fifty millions* in the red.

Recently the Administration took steps to increase the amount of loans from the Farmers Home Administration to farm families with incomes of a thousand dollars or less. Nothing, in view of the agencies lending record, could offer more convincing proof that it exists primarily to pass out the money and get votes.

The Hoover Commission also took a look at the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation, created in 1938 with $100,000,000 of government capital. We remember how, as the war came on, farmers insured their crops (premiums often weren't paid until harvest time), then went off into war factories and collected from the government when their neglected crops failed. This was ultimately changed. But to date, the agency is actually $2,131,000 in the red on its capital structure. At the same time (with its capital exhausted), insurance outstanding represents a potential liability of Congress to the extent of $347,758,000.

UNESCO: South Africa is withdrawing from UNESCO. That UN body is completely inefficient and practically futile, Prime Minister Strijdom informed the South African Assembly. UNESCO's only value is to the small number of theoreticians and scientists employed on UNESCO's surveys, the Prime Minister stated, but it is useful to no one else and in certain respects actually dangerous to South Africa. Although UNESCO will be carrying on in the future as it has in the past, it is unnecessary for South Africa to help finance the undermining of its own policy, he added.

Nor is South Africa the only member country displeased with UNESCO. At UNESCO's Montevideo Conference, Mr. Strijdom stated, a large number of very important countries were dissatisfied with the UN's educational, scientific and cultural agency and, indeed, were so critical that UNESCO's then Director General resigned his post.

At Harvard: Conservative intellectuals on the East coast are talking about a debate to be held at Harvard University on May 10 at the New Lecture Hall, Cambridge, Massachusetts, at 7:45 p.m. The subject is "Conservative Action" and the participants are Russell Kirk (see enclosed book review), author, lecturer and proponent of American conservatism; and his opponent, Professor Arthur Schlesinger, Jr., ADA, left-wing writer and professor. The Harvard Conservative League sponsors the event and the League's faculty adviser, Professor Crane Brinton, will act as moderator.

Letter from JOHN CHAMBERLAIN, Author and Editor: "I find HUMAN EVENTS an absolutely indispensable guide to what is going on behind the scenes in Washington. If I were reduced to a single publication, I would subscribe to HUMAN EVENTS, with the assurance that in so doing I would be putting myself in the best position to understand the shape of things to come."

HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor, and taxes. Published usually in two sections: a 4-page news section and a 4-page article section.
Entered as second class matter at Washington, D. C. Copyright 1955.

TRIAL SUBSCRIPTION for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1. Yearly rate, $10; 6 months, $6; 3 months, $3. By first class mail, $11.50 a year; by airmail (including APO and FPO) $13 a year. FOREIGN: by regular mail, $12 a year; airmail, $18. Allow us 2 weeks to process new subscriptions and changes of address. Bound Annual Volume with complete index, $15. 1954 volume now ready.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Academic Freedom, by Russell Kirk. Chicago: Henry Regnery Company. $3.75. Reviewed by Suzanne La Follette.

Academic Freedom, says Russell Kirk, is "the right or group of rights, intended to make it possible for certain persons . . . to teach truthfully and to employ their reason to the full extent of their intellectual powers." And religion is its indispensable support. Scholars, he says, are Bearers of the Word, and if they forget that fear of God is the beginning of wisdom they will follow wandering fires, lost in the quagmire.

Mr. Kirk defends his position with persuasive eloquence, which will hardly shield him from the scorn of those with whom God is out of fashion. But the scoffers might do well, before rejecting his definition of the valid ends of scholarship, to reappraise their own, just to make sure they are not substituting for God some such god-word as "democracy."

Mr. Kirk finds academic freedom menaced by "educational levellers" — ambitious administrators in many of our state-supported institutions of higher learning who are sacrificing academic standards to huge enrollments. "In our anxiety to give everyone a college degree, we are giving no one an education." And the professor who dares question the academic standards of the degree-factory is arrogantly reminded by his administrative superiors that he is not indispensable, or is even summarily dismissed. Such is one aspect—and an alarming one—of "education for democracy."

Another kind of levelling proceeds in our state-supported institutes of technology. There the assumption is widespread that the purpose of education is "a deliberate transfer of the methods of physical engineering to the control and direction of men in the mass." Such an inhuman assumption is, of course, by definition inimical to freedom of the mind.

It is not strange that Mr. Kirk finds academic freedom more generally respected in the privately supported educational foundations. But even there the political threat is present; the greatest of all threats to freedom: that of totalitarian political forces, and especially of Communism.

Mr. Kirk takes issue with "two bodies of opinion on the political rights and duties of the clerisy": the "indoctrinators" and the "doctrinaire liberals." The indoctrinators he defines as "the band of things as they are, represented by Mr. William F. Buckley, Jr., and the band of social reconstructionists dominated by one faction of the disciples of John Dewey." The indoctrinators, he thinks, would undo academic freedom by excessive regulation; the doctrinaire liberals by allowing it to become license.

When the author declares that Mr. Buckley, in demanding the promulgation of "faith in Christianity, and individualism," is asking two contradictory things, I think he is unjust. He imposes on Mr. Buckley the Godwinian definition of individualism: "denial that life has any meaning except gratification of the ego." Surely, Webster is as good an authority as Godwin, and Webster does not bear out Mr. Kirk's contention that individualism is incompatible with Christianity. Mr. Kirk is on firmer ground when he objects to cramming Christianity down people's throats, although it may be argued with some justice that it has a legitimate place in institutions founded to promote Christian teaching.

The opposite band of indoctrinators are the extremists of "education for democracy." In their scheme, says the author, the Academy would become simply the upper level of an educational machine for ensuring an equalitarian collectivism, and teachers would be slaves of "democracy" or "the people" —in the last analysis of the ruling clique. Mr. Kirk thinks such a "democracy" would be leaderless and mindless. I grant that it would be mindless, never leaderless; *vide* Soviet Russia.

The doctrinaire liberals are well exemplified by Professor H. S. Commager and Mr. Robert M. Hutchins, two of the more hysterical enemies of legislative concern with the Communist conspiracy. Mr. Kirk expertly demolishes their contention that Communism does not exist in our colleges, and that if it does, it is harmless.

The doctrinaire liberals, he thinks, are really afraid of themselves. Their world has dissolved overnight and left them lost and terrified of every shadow. "They are democrats and they denounce the elected representatives of the people; they are liberals and they mourn for the liberties of totalitarians. Confronted by the Soviet ogre, they insist that they are in imminent danger of being swallowed by Republican Congressmen."

I am inclined to think that if the Liberal world has dissolved, no one beside Mr. Kirk is yet aware of it. I think the "liberals" are more afraid of the representatives of the people than of the Soviet ogre

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

because they are themselves unwitting totalitarians. They are New Deal statists. They want domination and direction of American life by a "liberal" bureaucracy, with all the whoopla and hooey of what Pegler calls the Era of Wonderful Nonsense. In short, they are socialists, and they instinctively regard any attack on Communists, who are socialists, too (besides being Soviet agents), as an indirect menace to themselves. This makes them the perfect transmission belt for Communism.

Mr. Kirk finds the views of these people less baneful than those of the indoctrinators. If this be true it is also only abstractly. For the doctrinaire — or totalitarian — liberals happen to have their hands on the levers of power. They strongly influence our Federal policy; they dominate our media of communication; they direct our richest tax-exempt foundations; and theirs is the controlling voice in our educational system. By comparison, Mr. Buckley (who will no doubt be flattered to find himself treated as a movement) and the indoctrinators simply do not exist.

Mr. Kirk has written a brilliant and provocative book; one that should be read by everyone interested in the preservation of freedom whether in the Academy or outside.

Suzanne La Follette is a former Managing Editor of *The Freeman* magazine.

You may wish to buy Russell Kirk's "Academic Freedom" for (1) yourself; (2) your son or daughter at college; (3) your city's public library; (4) certain educators needing this criticism. You can buy it from HUMAN EVENTS at the bookstore price of $3.75. With EACH book, we will give you a free 8-weeks' subscription to HUMAN EVENTS. You may have the 8 weeks added to your subscription. Better yet, *send the subscription to someone else who should be reading HUMAN EVENTS.* In sending us your orders, specify the names and addresses of those to whom you want (1) books sent, (2) subscriptions sent. Allow two weeks for fulfillment of orders for subscriptions and books.

To HUMAN EVENTS, 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.

Enclosed find $..... to pay for..... copies of "Academic Freedom."

Send the books to

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Send 8-week subscriptions to

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

Name.....
Street.....Zone.....
City.....State.....

If you choose to extend your own subscription by the number of weeks warranted by this order, write "X" here ☐

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Vol. XII, No. 19 HUMAN EVENTS May 7, 1955

Article Section

UP THE DEMOCRATS: HOW THAT PARTY CAN WIN

By HANDICAPPER

SOMETIMES IT looks as if the newspapers picked their political correspondents in Washington from the men on their staffs who know the least about practical politics. The eggheadier dispatches from the national capital right after the Democrats took over Congress certainly made it look that way. Remember? — all those columns about how Eisenhower would now have a Congress that he could do business with? The broadtailed GOP obstructionists from the river bottom country could holler and sweat; the Eisenhower program would be cheerfully taken over by the forward-looking Democrats. If I haven't got my pundits mixed, it was Walter Lippmann who wrote, "Now he will find himself among friends."

Walter might more aptly have made it: "Now he belongs to the ages," as far as the Democrats are concerned. Politically wise writers, unconfused by "transcendent issues," would have reminded their readers that forward-looking Democrats look forward exclusively to the next election. They want no part of Eisenhower programs or Republican programs or bipartisan programs. They want in.

To the party-wise reporter whose political instincts have not been vitiated by reading Roscoe Drummond or the Alsop brothers, it was no startling shock when Senator McClellan (Dem., Ark.), who had succeeded Bill Jenner as Chairman of the Senate Internal Security Committee, announced that his witch burners would rekindle the fires under the Department of Defense on account of the promotion of Dr. Irving Peress, the Fifth Amendment dentist! To an old fox like McClellan, any politician who would drop a hot political issue like Reds in the Army must be too stupid to stay in business.

From what the column boys had been feeding us, you might have thought that, after what happened to Joe McCarthy, no Democrat would dare touch Peress with a tenfoot curette. Devotees of Ernest Lindley or Tom Stokes probably expected the Democrats to leave him lay where McCarthy flang him — lest Edward R. Murrow give them the business on TV.

Yet here were the Democrats, tumbling over one another to get in on that "dead" issue, tolerance of Communism! Stu Alsop reported that the new hearings on Peress were a crashing bore; but so far nobody has warned the nation of the menace of "McClellanism." The Democrats understand politics well enough to detect whether an issue is still breathing. And anti-Communism, they have decided, is no stiff. If Ike's privy councilors were dumb enough to throw this vote getter out the window, the Democrats are smart enough to pick it up, dust it off, and maybe go all the way with it.

Published weekly at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C.
Copyright 1955 by HUMAN EVENTS, INC.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

However, the Democrats can't go all the way, up to and including the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, 1956, unless they manage to shake Adlai Stevenson and the neo-liberals and let the country look at a solid, middle-of-the-road Grover Cleveland-type candidate. At this stage I would be surprised to see Eisenhower lose, in spite of all his advisers can do to hurt him.

But, beginning with Governor Frank Lausche of Ohio and carrying on through a considerable list including Senator Richard Russell of Georgia, anybody can name right-wing Democratic candidates who could make things tough. But how to get such a deserving Democrat nominated? The Soapy Williams-Junior Roosevelt-Senator Lehman forces know something about politics too. Ex-chairman Mitchell, who represents the Stevenson-Truman-CIO "management group," demands a purge of the Tories (Governors Kennon, Allen Shivers, Jimmy Byrnes) if they attempt to appear as delegates to the Democratic Convention next year. Since the free-loaders on the Democratic Party organization don't want a real Democrat, the situation calls for a Trojan Horse.

Consequently, I offer to the anti-New Deal Democrats my private Handicapper's formula for knocking off a front-running "liberal." If it bears a superficial resemblance to the 1952 model Lodge-Brownell mugging operation which nominated Ike, after the Taft forces had buttoned up the whole convention down to the messenger boys, that is because tried and proven tactics win elections. The Lodge-Brownell strategy, now offered as Handicapper's Convention Special, is the Statue of Liberty play applied to politics.

THE FIRST STEP is to forget the idea that the job is to convince 1200 sweating, heaving delegates that your man would make a good President, or even a good candidate. Forget whether he's a "liberal" or an "isolationist," or whether he's for foreign aid or a high protective tariff. The delegates read *Time* and know things like that before they hit the convention city.

But it isn't a candidate's "views" that get him nominated, although "views" can beat him. In 1952 the GOP delegates yelled themselves hoarse at every nationalistic, pro-American utterance by MacArthur or Herbert Hoover. But they nominated the candidate of the "internationalist" bloc, which didn't have a majority in the convention but which had one thing the Taft backers forgot to equip themselves with, namely a gaudy, flamboyant and thoroughly phony "Moral Issue." The "We Like Ike" forces went to Chicago with a lot of money and a candidate whose speeches sounded like a West Point speech-day exercise, but they came away with the jackpot. The Moral Issue, whooped up while Taft's delegates were being stolen, did it.

Handicapper's formula is to give the right-wing Democrats the Moral Issue that will enable them to pull the rug from under the ADA-tainted management of their party and take over themselves.

To build a Moral Issue, you first start a fight somewhere. Hitler sent his goons into the streets to attack almost anybody for the sake of stirring up something. The Communists get themselves beaten up by the cops or "take the Fifth," whether they need to or not, just to get people mad. Crooked politicians create a ruckus in the rear of the hall.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Eisenhoweristas of 1952 promoted fake battles in state and local conventions and primaries. The idea was to get thrown out of the hall, thus creating a Moral Issue.

In the confusion, nobody is supposed to ask whether the invaders had any business in the meeting or not. It is a popular concept, going back at least to the Bull Moose movement in 1912, that a Moral Issue is the reward for being thrown out of a "packed" convention. The late Maury Maverick tried the same tactics with the Texas Democratic delegation in 1952, but Democrats, being tougher than Republicans, can take a Moral Issue or leave it alone. They threw Maury out. The Republicans threw out the Taft delegates, and seated their Mavericks.

If the Democratic Party has the wit to capitalize on what has happened since 1952, it will shake out the ADA, grab the issues which the White House let be snatched from its hands, and go conservative. It is with the mechanics of "seizing power," as the Leninists call it, that old Handicapper is concerned. Probably the idea of parading in front of Adlai Stevenson's headquarters with banners reading "Thou shalt not steal!" wouldn't work with Democrats.

They learned their politics in Tammany wards, the dim recesses of South Chicago and the county satrapies of the South — not at chicken croquette luncheons by the Foreign Policy Association. Where Democrats come from, rigid acceptance of the Eighth Commandment is subject to the ameliorating influence of the substance of Eddie Arcaro's famous injunction, "Don't get beat no noses!" To a Democrat, a man carrying a sign reading "Thou shalt not steal" in a delegate contest would be regarded as half-witted. The introduction of the Moral Issue will have to be accomplished by subtler means than that.

Of course, this time the Moral Issue could be a genuine one, capable of smoking out the real independent voters who thought they were voting for a conservative in 1952 (and I'm not saying they weren't), and who would like just once before they die to vote for a man who can't be suckered into "four-power conferences" or vast, expensive and usually futile "foreign aid programs." But the fact that millions are waiting to vote for a candidate like that doesn't mean that he can be nominated by automation.

FIRST COMES THE PULVERIZING of the opposition, in this case the boys who right now control the central machinery of the Democratic Party. The Taft forces almost controlled the GOP party organization in 1952. But they were unhorsed by a series of skillfully planned raids, mostly in the South but also in New Jersey and other states where Democrats were invited to come in and help pick Ike delegates, after which, they were told, they could skedaddle back to where they came from, and no questions asked.

Perhaps there are Republicans who can return the compliment by invading Democratic Party councils and putting over a set of delegates who would back a Harry Byrd type candidate. If the interlopers were thrown out on their ears, there would be your Moral Issue and material for a real stink at the convention. The phonier these synthetic Democrats and the cruder their efforts to crash the opposition party, the hotter the resulting Moral Issue. When you stop to think how easy it was to sell conservative Republican delegates on the preposterous notion that Bob Taft had stolen something, or could steal

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

anything, a stampede based on the proposition that Adlai Stevenson had violated all Ten Commandments in that order ought to be an absolute lock, as we handicappers put it when in our natural habitat.

Once nominated, a Tory Democrat would have several advantages which Eisenhower lacked as a campaigner. For one thing, he would not be encumbered by the "friendly" advice of the liberal columnists, advice which would probably have beaten Ike if he had paid it any mind. (Might as well begin talking Democrat now as later.)

The Alsops *et al.*, who were constantly egging Ike to snub McCarthy, repudiate Jenner, kick Taft in the shins — in short to do everything possible to elect Stevenson — would lay off a conservative Democrat as if he were a leper.

THE AVOIDANCE WOULD BE MUTUAL. Democrats probably remember that, as long as it looked as if Ike might fall for this nonsense, he was in poor shape as a candidate. It wasn't until he had signed the consortium with Taft and began mauling Harry and the "mess" in Washington, that he began to get somewhere. Even then it wasn't better than 8 to 5 against until little Nixon, having ridden out a left-wing assault by summoning a cocker spaniel to his aid, began swinging at the Reds.

Of course Ike and Sherman Adams and Walter Lippmann forgot how Ike got elected as soon as the votes were counted, but the right-wing Democrats haven't forgotten. If they had, you wouldn't see Senator McClellan eagerly rummaging about in the Peress mess for tidbits that Joe McCarthy might have missed — and forgetting to probe the "outrage" of Dixon-Yates.

The columnists would still ply their trade, explaining to their clients that the candidate's cause was hopeless unless he cuddled up to Stevenson and the ADA, just as they tried to convince Ike in 1952 that the formula for Republican victory was to split the Republican party in twain. But this soothsaying would get nowhere with the boys from the bayous or the boys from the river wards. They know what licked the Democrats last time, even if the Republicans don't.

These days as I curl up with my *Congressional Record* and the *New York Times,* watching the "forward looking" Democrats, whom the columns used to tout as Eisenhower's secret allies, tear into foreign aid, "Secretary of Peace" Stassen and the Friendly Promoters of Peress, I begin to wonder whether the Democrats are going to need Handicapper's July Special after all. Maybe they did overstay Truman beyond what the traffic would bear, and it's hard to forgive them for handing us Roosevelt at all. But, judging Democrats solely on their ability to pick winners, it's hard to fault them. If they suspect the public is really in the mood for a conservative, they may come up with one, Handicapper or no Handicapper.

On December 22, 1954, we offered "Those 'Liberal' Journalists" by "Handicapper." The author is a long-suffering employee of a so-called "right-wing" paper and therefore prefers a pseudonym.

Additional Copies of the 4-page Article: 6 for $1; 10 for $1.50; 50 for $5.50; 100 for $10; 500 for $15; 1,000 for $25. Quotations for larger quantities on request.

HUMAN EVENTS, published at 1835 K Street, N.W., Washington 6, D. C., is a weekly newsletter reporting from Washington on politics, business, labor and taxes. It was founded in 1944 by Frank C. Hanighen. It is usually published in two parts: a 4-page news-section and a 4-page article. $10 per year. *Trial subscription for new subscribers only: 8 weeks for $1.*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED